

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10, 13, 14, 16-19, 21-23, 25, 28 and 29 are pending. The Final Action dated June 19, 2007 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted on June 27, 2007. During the interview, the U.S.C. § 101 rejections were discussed, however no agreement was reached that the claims were patentable. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues raised or remaining.

Claims 1-8, 10, 13, 14, 16-19, 21-23, 25, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the Claims do not recite a useful result and that Claim 16 does not disclose in what type of medium the computer program product is embodied. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Regarding rejected independent Claim 1, the Examiner states “If the claim as a whole is reasonably interpreted as just solving a mathematical algorithm rather than reciting a practical application of the algorithm which produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, then it would be non-statutory.” (Emphasis added.) Applicants note that Claim 1 is an apparatus claim and respectfully suggest that if the Examiner is interpreting an apparatus as “just solving a mathematical algorithm,” the Examiner may be misreading the Claims.

While Applicants maintain that the rejection of Claim 1 is improper, in the interests of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite “An apparatus configured to compute a result of a floating-point operation ....” This amendment is made for the purposes of

more clearly identifying, to even non-technical readers, that Claim 1 recites a useful apparatus. This amendment does not add new matter and is not made in response to any cited art. Accordingly, Applicants do not surrender any equivalents encompassed by the Claims as a result of this amendment.

Practical utility is a shorthand way of attributing "real-world" value to claimed subject matter. In other words, one skilled in the art can use a claimed discovery in a manner which provides some immediate benefit to the public. M.P.E.P. § 2107.01.I, citing *Nelson v. Bowler*, 206 USPQ 881, 883 (CCPA 1980). Applicants respectfully assert that an apparatus configured for "computing floating-point operations" provides immediate benefit to the public. See paragraph [0012] of the published application. Some embodiments of the invention, as recited in Claim 1, comprise improved Floating-Point Units (FPUs). See the Abstract and paragraph [0011] of the published application. FPUs have been useful elements of computer architecture for a number of years. See paragraph [0004] of the published application.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of Claim 1 has been overcome and that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-8, 10, 13 and 14 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these dependent Claims should also be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of Claims 1-8, 10, 13 and 14 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 16 has been amended to recite "A computer program product, embodied on a computer readable medium, for computing a result of a floating-point operation ...." (Emphasis added.) Thus, Claim 16 does disclose in what type of medium the computer program product is embodied. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that floating point operations,

specifically improved floating point operations “that address at least some of the problems associated with conventional methods and apparatuses for floating point computations,” provide a useful result. Paragraph [0011]. See also the arguments above regarding Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of Claim 16 has been overcome and that Claim 16 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 17-19, 21-23, 25, 28 and 29 depend from and further limit Claim 16. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these dependent Claims should also be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of Claims 16-19, 21-23, 25, 28 and 29 be withdrawn.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 1-8, 10, 13, 14, 16-19, 21-23, 25, 28 and 29.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 of IBM Corporation.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this Application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: September 18, 2007  
CARR LLP  
670 Founders Square  
900 Jackson Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
Telephone: (214) 760-3030  
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/  
Gregory W. Carr  
Reg. No. 31,093